



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/518,292

12/16/2004

Mark W. Cater

25029/101/101

7055

40306 7590 10/14/2009
SHEWCHUK IP SERVICES
3356 SHERMAN CT. STE. 102
EAGAN, MN 55121

EXAMINER

KASHNIKOW, ERIK

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1794

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

10/14/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/518,292	Applicant(s) CATER ET AL.	
	Examiner ERIK KASHNIKOW	Art Unit 1794	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 September 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. In light of the arguments presented in the reply filed 09/23/09, prosecution has been reopened.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-4, 6-10, 12-19 and 24-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lehotonen et al. (US 4,996,062) in view of Akao et al. (US 5,492,741) and dictionary.com used as evidentiary reference (<http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/dextrose>).

4. Lehotonen et al. teach a foodstuff package which contains an oxygen scavenging system (column 3 lines 31-41).

5. In regards to claims 1, 3-4, 6-10 and 27 Lehotonen et al. teach a package which contains foodstuff, as well as a mixture of the enzymes glucose oxidase and catalase, which is used to eliminate oxygen from the atmosphere (column 3 lines 31-41).

Lehtonen et al. teach that the material is packaged in an inert air atmosphere (column 8 lines 25-30), which one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would recognize that this package would include a headspace.

Art Unit: 1794

6. In regards to claims 6 and 7 Lehotonen et al. also teach the use of glucose as a substrate in their oxygen scavenging system (column 5 lines 65-68).

7. In regards to claim 9, dextrose is one of two stereoisomers of glucose, and is the most common form of glucose, and therefore would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention (See the definition of glucose as found on <http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/dextrose>.)

8. In regards to claims 12- 13 Lehotonen et al. teach that glucose oxidase be present in quantities of 10-1000 Units/kg (column 4 lines 4-5), and catalase in quantities of the same amount (Column 3 line 57-58) this meets the lower range of applicants claimed ranges.

9. In regards to claim 24 Lehotonen et al. teach that the composition can be incorporated into the package prior to the addition of the food product (column 6 lines 49-52).

10. In regards to claims 25-28 Lehotonen et al. teach that the composition can also be embodied in a 3 dimensional form, when it is added to the actual food product (column 6 line 42-44), or sprayed onto the food product surface (column 6 lines 44-48).

11. In regards to claim 14 absent a showing of criticality with respect to the amount of glucose, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to adjust the amount of glucose through routine experimentation in order to achieve an effective oxygen scavenger. It has been held that discovering an optimum value of a result effective variable involves only routine skill in the art. In re Boesch, 617 F.2d 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980).

12. In regards to claims 15 and 17-19 it would have been obvious under the guidelines presented in the preceding paragraph to vary the amount of glucose and neutralizing agent present in order to achieve an effective oxygen scavenger.

13. As stated above Lehotonen et al. teach an enzyme system, however they are silent regarding the system comprising an oxidoreductase enzyme as well as a solid neutralizing agent.

14. In regards to claims 1 and 2 Akao et al. teach an oxygen scavenging composition which can consist of glucose oxidase, glucose and a multitude of other chemicals. Akao et al. further teach that the oxygen scavenging system can further comprise a combination of these materials. In regards to these claims the glucose would act as the energy source and glucose oxidase would act as the enzyme system (column 30 line 62 – column 31 line 22). Akao et al. further teach the inclusion of sodium bicarbonate and activated carbon, both of which one of ordinary skill in the art would recognize could act as non aqueous neutralizing agents (column 31 lines 15-18). Since sodium bicarbonate is a preferred neutralizing agent taught by Applicant's all the properties of the neutralizing agent taught in the instant claims are inherent. Since the materials used by Akao et al. are the same as those taught in the dependant and independent claims of the instant application they would be inherently dry. In regards to the last 2 lines of claim one, since Akao et al. teach the same materials as Applicant's all the limitations of the last two lines would be intrinsically the same. It is also pointed out that given that Lehotonen et al. and Akao et al. disclose composition as presently claimed, it is clear that the composition would inherently enhance the shelf-life of a packaged product.

Art Unit: 1794

Further it is pointed out that as all aspects of the instant invention are taught by Lehtonen and Akao et al. then the enzyme system of Lehtonen and Akao et al. would intrinsically be activated by moisture of a packaged product to scavenge oxygen from the headspace through the instantly claimed reaction.

15. In regards to claims 29 and 30 the modified invention of Lehotonen and Akao et al. teach all the limitations instantly claimed and in the current format do not require any outside limitations which would place the invention outside the bounds presented by the closed language term "consisting of".

16. In regards to claim 29 Akao et al. teach that sodium bicarbonate is included in its oxygen scavenging system however are silent regarding it being in powder form, however one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would be aware that sodium bicarbonate is a white solid, and it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include this white solid in powder form so as to be able to include the sodium bicarbonate easily into the package.

17. In regards to claim 30 while Lehotonen et al. state that the powder form can be prepared with an inert carrier material, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that the inclusion of the neutralizing agent of Akao et al. into the package would eliminate the need for the carrier material, as the sodium bicarbonate would be able to act as a carrier material.

18. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the package containing an oxygen scavenging system of Lehotonen et al. with the oxygen scavenging system of Akao et al. because the package of

Art Unit: 1794

Lehotonen et al. which offers the inhibition of growth of aerobic spoilage organisms, would benefit from the ability to protect food that is degrade by oxygen (column 39 lines 27-35).

19. Claims 5 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lehotonen et al. (US 4,996,062) in view of Akao et al. (US 5,492,741) and Stougaard et al. (US 6,251,626).

20. As stated above Lehotonen et al. and Akao et al. teach a composition for use as an oxygen scavenging system for food. However both Lehotonen et al. and Akao et al. are silent regarding the use of hexose oxidase.

21. Stougaard et al. teach that hexose oxidase is an enzyme that in the presence of oxygen can capable of oxidizing dextrose and a multitude of other reducing sugars (column 1 lines 19-20).

22. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use this in the inventions of Lehotonen et al. and Akao et al. because this enzyme can utilize a broader range of substrates and therefore make the claimed invention more flexible (column 1 lines 27-28).

23. Claims 20-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lehotonen et al. (US 4,996,062) in view of Akao et al. (US 5,492,741) and Ernst (US 5,284,871).

Art Unit: 1794

24. As stated above Lehotonen et al. and Akao et al. teach a composition for use as an oxygen scavenging system for food. However both Lehotonen et al. and Akao et al. are silent regarding the use of water permeable enclosures for the composition.

Lehotonen

25. Ernst teaches storing an oxygen scavenging system in a water permeable container enclosed with the product, including pouches (column 8 line 67 to column 9 line 9). It would also be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that a pouch and enclosed pouch and a sachet are all different design choices for a pouch.

26. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the invention of Lehotonen et al. and Akao et al. with the invention of Ernst because the invention of Ernst further protects foods by preventing the release of radicals into the food (column 9 lines 37+).

Response to Arguments

27. In regards to Applicant's arguments concerning the inclusion of the iron, the rejection has been amended to an embodiment wherein iron is not required.

28. In regards to arguments regarding consisting essentially thereof, while it is recognized that the phrase "consisting essentially of" narrows the scope of the claims to the specified materials and those which do not materially affect the basic and novel characteristics of the claimed invention, absent a clear indication of what the basic and novel characteristics are, "consisting essentially of" is construed as equivalent to "comprising". Further, the burden is on the applicant to show that the additional

ingredients in the prior art, i.e. iron, would in fact be excluded from the claims and that such ingredients would materially change the characteristics of the applicant's invention, See MPEP 2111.03. Examiner also points out that in the rejections current format the only portion of the Akao reference being used are the oxidoreductase and the solid neutralizing agent. It is noted that Applicant's have stated that an insignificant amount of iron would not fall outside the limits of the claims. In regards to the Applicants remarks concerning the term "consisting essentially of" with respect to the new limitations Examiner points out that as all aspects of the invention are present it would inherently be activated by moisture to scavenge oxygen from a headspace by the instantly claimed reaction. It is noted that as both sodium bicarbonate and activated carbon have neutralizing capabilities then they fall under the limitations of both "consisting essentially of" and "consisting of".

29. In regards to the arguments concerning the Stougaard and Ernst references note that while they do not disclose all the features of the present claimed invention, they are used as teaching reference, and therefore, it is not necessary for this secondary reference to contain all the features of the presently claimed invention, *In re Nievelt*, 482 F.2d 965, 179 USPQ 224, 226 (CCPA 1973), *In re Keller* 624 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871, 881 (CCPA 1981). Rather this reference teaches a certain concept, and in combination with the primary reference, discloses the presently claimed invention. If the secondary reference contained all the features of the present claimed invention, it would be identical to the present claimed invention, and there would be no need for secondary references.

Conclusion

30. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ERIK KASHNIKOW whose telephone number is (571)270-3475. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 7:30-5:00PM EST (Second Friday off).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rena Dye can be reached on (571) 272-3186. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Erik Kashnikow
Examiner
Art Unit 1794

/Rena L. Dye/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1794